

BROWNSVILLE FIRE RATES UP

NEW COMPANIES MUST TAKE
LIVE RISKS AT ALL.

Insurance from that Territory Headed
by Alderman Drescher Protests in
the Legislative Graft Committee.

All the fires are little ones.
A protest from Brownsville against
the insurance rates have been
raised there in the last few years
and with some vigor before the
present investigating committee at its
session yesterday. The Brownsville de-
legation of protestants was brought over
by Alderman Drescher.

Goell of 100 Pittkin avenue test-
ified that they had raised his rate from
about a hundred three years ago to
\$100. They told him, he said, that it was
because there were certain things that
ought to be altered on his property.
He said that if the buildings were built
according to the regulations of the city
and were all right three years ago he
would see why the rate had been increased.

George Tonganoy, another business-
man of Brownsville, said that his rate
had been raised from \$2.40 to \$4.50. When
he asked the companies about it they
said it was because he hadn't iron stairs.
He put in the stairs, he said, but there
was no reduction of the rate. When he
complained again the companies
told him he still needed some hose, which
he got; but still the rate stayed where
it was. This went on for some time.
Finally upon his demand they agreed to
turn him over with a detailed list of every-
thing required.

"The greater part of the demand,"
said the witness, "is that I put in a watch-
man day and night and pay him. If I
have this watchman then they will
lower the insurance."

He said that he had to pay a few dollars
for this list furnished him by a broker
to find out that a watchman was required.
He said that his experience was that the
companies would take no insurance what-
ever on the stock of tenants in Brown-
sville.

"Did they ever assign any reason why
they wouldn't take any?" asked Assem-
blyman Colne.

"No reason at all why they wouldn't
take any."

"Just simply they cannot buy insur-
ance?"

"They cannot buy insurance; that is
the law of the exchange and that is all."

Samuel Hotas, an insurance broker and
owner of Brownsville buildings, gave an
explanation for this. He said that the
reason that Brownsville got higher than
the exchange rates in some instances,
asked to state them, he said that house-
hold furniture they charged more for
the reason given by the companies for
all this was that the losses in Brownsville
exceeded those elsewhere. "Not many
companies," said he, "are willing to
insure there. There are a number of com-
panies that take them, but some com-
panies won't take them at all."

"Do you believe that this unwarranted
discrimination is placed on this territory
because it is inhabited by Hebrews?" he
asked Assemblyman Colne.

"Well, the district is more congested,
and there is some reflection cast upon
the class of people that reside there, I
must admit."

Asked whether it was true, as the com-
panies alleged, that there were more
fires than elsewhere, the witness said he
hadn't looked up the records.

Alderman Drescher gave figures show-
ing that the one engine company in
Brownsville showed a decrease in the
number of fires this year over last year
and that so far this year Brownsville
hadn't had a single two alarm fire.

"The companies find them easy people
and they, and through their brokers,
insurance where premiums amounted to
\$100,000 a year, expressed himself for-
tunately against an anti-compact law. "The
public," he said, "would find that they
would be paying more for poorer insur-
ance under such a law than under the
New York Fire Insurance Exchange."

The investigation will go on to-day.

SHOOT A BURGlar.

Henry E. Smith of Middletown Fires
Through a Door and Seizes a Hit.

MIDDLETOWN, N. Y., Dec. 19. Aroused
from his sleep by a noise in a room ad-
joining that in which he and his wife were
sleeping, Henry E. Smith, a grain mer-
chant of Howell, five miles from this
city, discovered that a burglar had gained
entry to the house. Smith soon
sought a rifle which he always keeps in
his room and gently turned the key in
the door separating his room from the
kitchen and fired. Presently the person
in the kitchen tried the bedroom door,
and Smith demanded what was wanted.

There was no answer, but the intruder
threw himself against the door, and Smith
fired again. He heard the intruder fall
and the sound of the man leaving the house.
He then dressed, Mr. Smith ran out of
the house and found a man staggering
around the yard with blood gushing
from a bullet wound in the neck.

Holding his horses Mr. Smith loaded
the injured man into the wagon and
brought him to the hospital. The man
died. Mr. Smith then gave himself up to
the authorities, but was released. The
burglar gave his name as John
Smith of New York. He is 30 years old. It
is believed that he entered the Smith
house believing the people to be away.
Shortly before he tried to get into the
room of John Hillard, but was frightened
away. While severely injured, he will
recover sufficiently to be taken to jail.

DR. KEELER SENTENCED.

Gigantic Dentist Who Robbed Several
Women Goes to Sing Sing.

Dr. Henry B. Keeler, the dentist who
pleaded guilty of robbing Mrs. Mary
Lynch, a widow, of all her savings,
amounting to more than \$10,000 after
entrapping a bigamous marriage with
her, was sentenced yesterday by Judge
Fawcett in the County Court, Brooklyn,
to not more than nine years and ten
months and not less than four years and
seven months in Sing Sing.

Judge Fawcett denounced the prisoner
as a man who had enticed several women
into bigamous marriages and who had
robbed them and characterized him as
a "despicable specimen of his sex."

The court suspended sentence in the
case of Emma C. Keeler, who pleaded
guilty in aiding her husband in the
bigamy of Mrs. Lynch.

Mexican Merger Earnings.

MEXICO CITY, Dec. 19.—An increase
of 8 per cent is shown in the estimated
earnings of the National Railways of
Mexico, owned and leased line, for the
first week of December, 1910, over the
first week of the same month last year.
The figures for 1910 were \$1,273,527, while
for 1909 they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909, were \$1,273,527, while for 1909
they were \$1,175,782. An increase of
102,745 was shown for the first week of
December, 1910, over the first week of
1909. The figures